

Yet today's Democrats are about power. So if the rules stand in the way, to heck with the rules. Ignore them. That is what the Senate Democrats did on the Judiciary Committee.

I also want to talk about Kristen Clarke, who has been likewise nominated to a senior position at the Department of Justice.

Like Ms. Gupta, Ms. CLARKE's record is that of an extreme radical. Last year, she wrote an op-ed in Newsweek, entitled: "I Prosecuted Police Killings. Defund the Police—But Be Strategic."

In that op-ed, Ms. CLARKE wrote about the protests that erupted last year and stated:

Into that space has surged a unifying call from the Black Lives Matter movement: "Defund the police."

Now, like Ms. Gupta, she tried to run away from her record. At the prompting of Senate Democrats and at the prompting of Chairman DURBIN, Ms. CLARKE said: No, no, no, no, no. I don't support defunding the police. She said: You know, it was just the headline of the article. I didn't write the headline. Ms. Gupta did the same thing. Both of them were instructed by their handlers to backpedal as quickly as possible from their repeated and explicit advocacy in writing. So Ms. CLARKE says she doesn't support defunding the police.

Yesterday, when Ms. CLARKE came before the Judiciary Committee, I asked her straightforwardly if she still thinks "defund the police" is a unifying call. That is what she wrote not 10 years ago, not 5 years ago but last year. She wouldn't answer the question. Instead, she just repeated her talking point: "I do not support defunding the police."

As I told Ms. CLARKE yesterday, that claim is objectively ridiculous. She asserted she doesn't advocate cutting the funding of police, which on its face was a lie.

In that same op-ed she wrote in Newsweek, there are no fewer than three separate paragraphs that begin with the following words: "We must invest less in the police"—three paragraphs in a row. Now, when you write three paragraphs that begin with "We must invest less in the police; we must invest less in the police; we must invest less in the police," you don't get to come and say: I don't support investing less in the police. That is objectively absurd, but, sadly, it is even worse.

Not only is Ms. CLARKE an extreme advocate for defunding the police, but she has a history of not just excusing but of celebrating murderers who have murdered police officers. It has been widely reported that, in college, Ms. CLARKE helped to organize a conference with speakers who referred to convicted cop killers as "political prisoners." This included Mumia Abu-Jamal, who murdered a Philadelphia police officer, and Assata Shakur, who was convicted of murdering a New Jersey State trooper, who escaped from

prison, and is on the FBI's Most Wanted list. Multiple speakers at the conference thanked Ms. CLARKE by name for inviting them to speak, and now the Democrats want Ms. CLARKE to head the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice.

I ask you the question that I asked Ms. CLARKE yesterday: What is a police officer in Philadelphia who is watching the proceedings before this body or a police officer in New Jersey who is watching C-SPAN today supposed to think about the Democrats nominating someone to a senior position at the Department of Justice, knowing that this individual participated in a conference celebrating and lionizing cop killers who murdered a Philadelphia cop and murdered a New Jersey State Trooper? How should a police officer today react to that news?

There are numerous Members of this body—Senate Democrats—who, when they go home to their States, like to tell their constituents they are not all that liberal; they are really quite reasonable; they are really quite moderate. Well, the nice thing about politics is that actions speak much more loudly than words. These two nominations—Ms. Gupta's, which we have before us right now, and Ms. CLARKE's, which I expect we will have before us relatively soon—are two of the most radical nominees ever to be put forward. Indeed, you could call the two of them the radical twins. They are zealots; they are ideologues; and they both are leading advocates for abolishing the police.

I say to my Democratic friends: This is a 50-50 Senate. That means just one of you—just 1 out of 50—could say: OK. Enough is enough.

How many Senate Democrats have gone home and said, "I don't support abolishing the police"? Quite a few Senate Democrats, I suspect, are telling their constituents back home that they don't support abolishing the police.

Today, you have a vote because I will tell you, if you as a Senator vote to confirm the radical twins, both of whom are among the leading advocates for abolishing the police, your constituents back home will know exactly where you stand on abolishing the police. You don't get to put radicals who want to abolish the police in the top positions of the Department of Justice and claim you oppose abolishing the police.

President Obama nominated for a senior position in the Department of Justice another lawyer who had celebrated and defended a cop killer, who had lionized a cop killer, and this body, in one of the few instances, decided that was too much; that was too far; and they were not going to confirm that lawyer.

Unfortunately, the Democratic Party has changed. The Democratic Party today is radicalized. They hate Donald Trump. Now, I understand Donald Trump is a unique character. I under-

stand that his existence and every word he uttered enraged the Democrats, but they have emerged from 4 years of the Trump administration more radical than any majority party in this body ever has been. There are quite a few Democrats who, when they are at home, like to pretend otherwise.

Today is a perfect opportunity to demonstrate that the pretense is not mere empty words. In fact, if you don't support abolishing the police, then don't support abolishing the police, and if you don't support celebrating cop killers, then don't confirm people who have celebrated cop killers to senior positions in the U.S. Department of Justice.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

HONORING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF HIRING ROBERT MONTGOMERY "BOBBY" KNIGHT AS THE HEAD COACH OF THE MEN'S BASKETBALL TEAM AT INDIANA UNIVERSITY

Mr. BRAUN. Madam President, I rise to honor the 50th anniversary of the signing of Coach Robert Montgomery Knight at Indiana University, who set the standard for excellence as a collegiate men's basketball coach.

Coach Knight had a legendary career as a college head coach for more than 40 years, 29 of which were at Indiana University. During those 29 years, Coach Knight had 11 Big Ten Conference championship teams, took 24 teams to the NCAA tournament, and earned 8 Big Ten Coach of the Year Awards. His 1975-1976 team at IU remains the last team to complete an undefeated season and win every game in the NCAA tournament. They got close this year.

Maureen, my wife, attended IU, and I can remember what a thrill it was to watch his teams play. Their drive and will to succeed were infectious. Coach Knight's success at IU continues to be a source of pride for the entire State of Indiana. Coach Knight never focused his coaching on winning a game but on the effort it takes to become a champion, saying that the will to succeed is important, but the will to prepare is even more important.

Due to his focus on his players' success on and off the court—this is amazing—Coach Knight had an astounding 98-percent graduation rate for all players whom he coached for at least 4 years—more than twice the average graduation rate for Division 1 schools. On the world stage, Coach Knight led the U.S. men's national basketball team to a Gold Medal in the 1979 Pan Am Games and to a Gold Medal in the 1984 Olympic Games.

Victory is fleeting, but Coach Knight both propelled young men toward greatness on the court and gave them experiences and lessons that have shaped their entire lives.

We honor the drive, determination, and character of Coach Knight and all

that he did in educating and mentoring hundreds of Indiana University players over three decades to bring pride to the State of Indiana.

For all the memories, Coach Knight, we give you a heartfelt thank you.

Madam President, as if in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 157, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 157) honoring the 50th anniversary of hiring Robert Montgomery "Bobby" Knight as the Head Coach of the men's basketball team at Indiana University.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. BRAUN. I know of no further debate on the measure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further debate, the question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 157) was agreed to.

Mr. BRAUN. I ask unanimous consent that the preamble be agreed to and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

Mr. BRAUN. I yield the floor.

MOTION TO DISCHARGE—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The assistant Democratic leader.

NOMINATION OF VANITA GUPTA

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, what is it about these nominees Vanita Gupta and Kristen Clarke that drives some of the Members on the other side of the aisle into a rage? Listen to how they describe them.

The senior Senator from Texas describes Vanita Gupta as a political "culture warrior," slandering and vilifying people. Then, of course, the junior Senator from Texas calls her an "extreme partisan ideologue." "Radical twins," he calls them.

What is it about these two nominees that drives them into such a state of mind that they say these things about individuals seeking an opportunity to again serve our Federal Government?

It is amazing to me that the junior Senator from Texas suggests that they are in the thrall of handlers. Handlers. If you heard the story of the lives of these two women and what they have overcome to be where they are today, the last thing in the world you would use is a reference to handlers. They have defied handlers all throughout their lives—sons of immigrants, daughters of immigrants. Like so many of

them, they know they have to work hard to prove themselves, and they have done it time and again.

Vanita Gupta. Can you picture that moment when the civil rights organizations said to Vanita Gupta: We want you to go to Tulia, TX, because something has happened there that looks like a terrible miscarriage of justice. Forty people have been arrested for drug crimes in Tulia, TX, and we want you to go down there, even though they are in jail and they have been convicted, and defend them and try to find a way that they will be released.

That is exactly what Vanita Gupta did. The net result was that they were not only released, but the lawman who had supposedly found them guilty was the one who was discredited and dishonored when it was over, and the Texas Governor—the Republican Texas Governor—acknowledged it with a pardon of these individuals and paying them millions of dollars for what they had lived through. Who led that charge? Vanita Gupta. Was she waiting for a message from a handler? No. She showed extraordinary courage there and throughout her life as an attorney fighting for the civil rights of others and as an attorney representing the Government of the United States of America and the Department of Justice.

When I listen to efforts to discredit her and her professionalism, I think, you haven't read the story. You would know in a second she doesn't wait to hear from a handler. She never has. She has shown exceptional courage and professionalism every step of the way.

Kristen Clarke, the same. Born in an area of New York City that I am sure Senator SCHUMER knows, in a public tenement type of building, she overcame all the odds. She graduated from law school and served in the Department of Justice.

When the junior Senator from Texas comes and refers to Vanita Gupta and Kristen Clarke as "radical twins," zealots, ideologues, it is disgusting. It is terrible. It is a terrible reference to a fine life that each of them has lived.

And this notion that somehow they have fooled the Fraternal Order of Police into believing that they really do love police, when, in fact, as the Republicans argue, they just want to take all their money away—we know better. The fact that Vanita Gupta has the endorsement of every major law enforcement organization puts to rest some of the charges they have made against her.

I can't believe what they are saying about these two nominees, but I think that a majority of the Senate is ultimately going to judge that they are ready to serve this country again and should, and the Department of Justice.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. The Senator from Utah has graciously yielded back his remaining time, so I ask unanimous

consent that I speak for a brief few minutes and then we vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. SCHUMER. And then yield back the rest of our time after that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOMINATION OF VANITA GUPTA

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, the Senate will soon vote on a motion to discharge the nomination of Vanita Gupta to serve as the next Attorney General—Associate Attorney General. The daughter of immigrants, she would be the first woman of color and the first civil rights attorney to serve as Attorney General.

Ms. Gupta is an exceptional nominee and an outstanding lawyer. It is confounding that her nomination has been tied up in the Judiciary Committee, requiring the Senate to take the extra procedural steps to move her nomination forward. But despite Republican obstruction, she will be confirmed by this Chamber in a few minutes.

Ms. Gupta's credentials speak for themselves. She most recently served as president and CEO of the Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights and served 4 years at the Justice Department.

Her first case after law school involved securing the release of several African Americans wrongly convicted by all-White juries in Texas.

At a time when so many in our country call for action against civil injustices and racial violence, how can we not install one of the Nation's top civil rights lawyers at the Department of Justice?

Senate Republicans, rather than evaluate Ms. Gupta on the merits of her accomplishments, have spent the last few weeks appealing to outlandish accusations that she is an out-of-touch, far-left radical.

The questions she endured during her confirmation hearing were utterly inane—from accusations that she is anti-police to the insinuation that she wants to legalize all drugs. A conservative judicial organization even launched a shameful national ad campaign to smear her reputation—her nomination. These smear tactics are nonsense.

Gupta commands the respect of civil rights advocates and law enforcement and has the endorsement from the National Fraternal Order of Police, the National Sheriffs' Association, the Association of Chiefs of Police, and the Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association. There is no mystery to Ms. Gupta's broad support. She is outstanding at what she does. She knows how to listen and work with others, including Republican Senators, and is deeply knowledgeable in the field. That is exactly—exactly—she is exactly the kind of person we need at the Department of Justice.

So I look forward to now moving on Ms. Gupta's nomination.

I yield back the rest of our time.